

**Minutes and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
General Business Majors and Minors, 2016-2017**

Date: April 20, 2017

Time: 10:30-11:30

Place: Hyland Hall 4301

Attended: Provost Susan Elrod; AVC Greg Cook; Dean John Chenoweth Program Coordinators Carol Brunt, Stephanie Douglas; faculty and staff in the General Business program Kelsey Michels; Audit & Review Team Chair S.A. Welch; Audit & Review team members Katy Casey, Joan Littlefield Cook, Ahmad Karim

1. Call to order
 - a. The meeting began at 10:35am
2. Introductions and overview

S.A. Welch summarized the strengths of the major over the audit & review period. The major has a large enrollment and is an attractive option for many students. Carol Brunt, who took over as coordinator in November 2016, has made progress in establishing oversight agencies within the major.
3. Dean John Chenoweth provided background information about the major as well as its role within the College of Business and Economics. He noted that an advisory board was being established for the General Business major. Program Coordinator Carl Brunt noted that there are 582 in the major and that the enrollment for the online classes was increasing. She noted that the advising checklist was being reviewed and might change in the future. In addition, the program has added an internal “steering committee” to provide direction to the department coordinator and faculty.
4. Discussion of the Review Team’s evaluation
 - a. Structure and function of the program. Committee questions regarding this topic (e.g., coordinator, internal advising committee and oversight, and external advisory board) were addressed in the dean’s opening comments.
 - b. Assessment. What measures were being taken to adequately assess the students’ knowledge in the program? A concern of the Audit and Review team is the report’s indication that focusing on “understanding” and final course grades may not give an adequate level of assessment. There was much discussion of what courses should be assessed. There was discussion about the major focusing on breadth vs. depth of knowledge. It was suggested that integration of knowledge might be a fruitful way to address the knowledge base of the students in the major. There does seem to be adequate assessment of the College Core courses but there was discussion of what courses and learning outcomes are unique to the General Business major. Assessing courses that are unique to the General Business major, and learning outcomes that differentiate this program from other majors, is a way to determine how well the major is doing in meeting its goals and objectives. When the courses unique to the General Business major are not assessed, stakeholders may be left

with uncertainty and this could create problems in defining and focusing on the contributions of the major to the College of Business and Economics. In addition, greater clarity on what the major entails and how it differs from other majors may help with marketing the major to the business community.

There was discussion of what the program is planning for assessment, but it was strongly emphasized that what was needed is more than a plan: Data collection, analysis, and reporting are overdue. It was noted that assessment was a concern in the program's previous Audit & Review, indicating an ongoing lack of attention to assessment. It is imperative that assessment data be collected, analyzed, summarized and included in the upcoming Audit & Review Progress report due in 2019.

The program coordinator noted that she began her position in November and that she appreciated the feedback on where to head next with assessing student knowledge in the major. The review team noted their appreciation of the challenges facing the new coordinator, especially given the size and distributed structure of the major. However, it was noted that adequate assessment is a key factor in program development, and the program is strongly encouraged to develop and implement a plan to assess student learning in the program.

5. Recommended Actions: The evaluation report lists 2 recommendations (see page 12, point 4)
6. Recommended Results: Continuation with major concerns (see page 12)
7. Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
 - A progress report that addresses the recommended actions is required. This report is due to the Dean of the College of Business & Economics by October 1, 2019 and to the Audit & Review Committee by November 1, 2019.
 - The program's next full self-study is due by October 1, 2021 to the Dean of the College of Business & Economics and to the Audit & Review Committee by November 1, 2021.

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Undergraduate Programs, 2016-2017
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation February 16, 2017 Short Self Study (SS*) _____

Program General Business Major X Minor X

Evaluations submitted by: S-A Welch, Katy Casey, Tony Gulig, Ahmad Karim, Joan Cook

Review meeting attended by: S-A Welch, Ahmad Karim, Joan Cook

I. Program Purpose & Overview: A. Centrality

1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's core values, Mission, and Strategic Plan.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. The program supports general education, proficiency, and/or other programs at UW-W.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

3. The program has achieved or is appropriately working toward achievement of at least two goals of Inclusive Excellence.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

4. The program has been responsive to actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review Report; Progress Reports have been submitted, if relevant.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments

2. I responded NA because the program is not a department and so doesn't offer courses. Instead, it draws from other departments' courses.
3. It is not clear what they do specifically in their classes for integrating inclusive excellence
3. In places, it can be a bit difficult to tell which of the points made/programs mentioned are for the college vs. specifically relevant for this major. I know it can be difficult to separate these given

the curricular and administrative structure of this major, but it's important to specifically address this major (throughout the self-study)

4. The self-study says the program is “continuing to explore sources for collecting assessment data pertaining to learning outcomes...” (page 3). This exploration has been going on for about 10 years—it is uncertain as to when some sort of action will occur.

I. Program Purpose & Overview: B. Program Mission, Goals, & Accomplishments

1. The program’s mission statement reflects the nature and scope of the program.	
Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
2. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve or advance the program.	
Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
3. The program has a process for setting and assessing goals, and making decisions about changes to the program goals.	
Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
4. The program is considering potential revisions to mission, goals, or objectives; the program has a “vision” for where it wants to be in the future and how to get there.	
Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
5. The program, faculty/staff, and/or students have earned recognition or awards.	
Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	2
6. The program has achieved or maintained program-level accreditation or has considered seeking it, where appropriate.	
Sufficient Evidence	
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

Comments

1. mission statement is too broad and sweeping....can't tell what specifically the department does to enhance learning. This may be due to the nature of the program, but it still was unclear.
2. I think the goal and objectives are good (they are succinct and direct). However, program is urged to consider including more objective assessments. The narrative response to this question included data from ETS, but that was not listed as a data source in the table provided.
2. Here's where information on program oversight is included. Please elaborate on how the oversight structure works (e.g., frequency of meetings, who is on the internal and external boards, the process for using data to make decisions, etc.). It's okay if all these details are not worked out yet, but the program needs to make sure it's thinking about how to make the best use of these advisory/steering groups.
3. The creation of the advisory committee is commendable and no doubt very helpful to setting program goals. However, the process of how those on the committee set program goals and review student progress was not provided.
4. like the mission statement, this is too broad and sweeping....can't tell specifics
6. Based on the Review Team's discussion, the review team's understanding is that there is no accreditation for this individual program. The program is part of the College which has accreditation.

II. Assessment: A. Curriculum

1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, including options or emphases within the program (if applicable).

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. If program offers dual-listed courses, the expectations of graduate students differ from undergraduate students; otherwise NA

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	3

3. Appropriate assessment data were used in making curricular revisions.

Sufficient Evidence	
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	1

4. The program provides opportunities for students to learn in ways that extend beyond the classroom, and discussed the extent to which students are involved in these activities and opportunities.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0

Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
--	---

5. Online courses are evaluated in ways that ensure effective delivery, continuous improvement, and student learning (if applicable)

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

2. They do not have dual listed courses
3. Changes were made to the curriculum (described in II.A.1). Were assessment data of any sort considered in making these changes?
4. It sounds like maybe a lot more students complete internships, but they do so through the Management department. Would it be possible to get the number of internships of GenBus majors completed through Mgmt? This may give a more accurate picture.

II. Assessment: B. Assessment of Student Learning

1. The program has a clearly articulated learning outcomes for students, courses are "mapped" to these learning outcomes, and some outcomes received specific attention during the review period.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	3
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. Student learning outcomes are aligned with the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes in a way that is reasonable and meaningful.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. The program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. The program collected a variety of appropriate assessment data allowing judgments about the extent to which students are achieving learning outcomes.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	4
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

5. Program faculty consider assessment data in making changes to the curriculum, students' learning outcomes, and/or other aspects of the program.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

6. Results of assessment efforts have been shared with appropriate internal and external constituencies.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Overall, this was a difficult area to evaluate. Many of the questions were left unanswered or were not sufficiently answered. It is not clear what assessment data were collected, how it is used to inform the program, and whether this information is shared in a reliable or meaningful way.
1. The program objectives (which I'm interpreting as program SLOs) listed on pages 4-6 are a good start. However, most are stated as "identify and understand...", which seems a bit vague and lower level. I'd like the program to revisit these. For example, what does 'understand' mean (be able to restate? Be able to compare and contrast? Apply to solve a problem?)? I suspect the actual standards for acceptable performance are higher than what the current wording seems to imply.
2. Nice job on alignment with LEAP.
3. There is a lot of reliance on course grades for assessment of student learning outcomes (pages 5-6). In my opinion, this is too broad a measure since grades tend to include a lot of things other than just evidence of student learning. But targeted assessment (i.e., focusing on a specific SLO) using embedded course assignments can be very useful. I encourage the program to work with the college and campus assessment staff to further develop and implement their assessment plan.
4. The lack of a response here implies that there are no data to report. This was an issue in the last A&R as well and needs to be addressed.
6. The report noted that this information will be supplied....what have they done so far?

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: A. Trend Data

1-2. Five-year enrollment and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. [MAJORS ONLY] Credits-to-degree show that students can complete the degree in four years, or reasonably efficiently.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. Program has strategies to recruit and retain diverse students.	
Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
5. [MAJORS ONLY] Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University	
Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
6. Students can enroll in appropriate courses and proceed without delaying graduation.	
Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
7. Claim that the program is oversubscribed, undersubscribed, or at optimum level is justified or supported by examples or data.	
Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

- 3. Credits to degree seems a bit high
- 5. How do the program’s demographics line up with the University’s demographics?

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: B. Demand for Graduates

1. [MAJORS ONLY] Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment or continue their education.	
Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
2. Data suggests that employment opportunities for graduates of this program will remain strong.	
Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.	
Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	1

No/Limited Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

III B 3--any way for you, yourself (as a program) track graduates?

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: C. Comparative Advantage(s)

1. The program has unique features that distinguish it from competing programs--giving it a competitive edge

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

IV. Resource Availability & Development: A. Faculty Characteristics

1-2. Information is provided about the composition of the department faculty & instructional academic staff (e.g., gender, ethnicity, expertise, academic rank, etc.)

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3-4. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

IV. Resource Availability & Development: B. Teaching & Learning Enhancement

1-2. Faculty & instructional academic staff are engaged in activities to enhance teaching and advising.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments

IV. Resource Availability & Development: C. Research & other Scholarly/Creative Activities
1-2. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in research and/or scholarly/creative activities.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments

1-2 This is not applicable because the program draws faculty from other departments and grants are awarded to those departments

IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding

1-2. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	3

Comments

1-2. Rated as NA because the program draws faculty from other departments. Grants are awarded to faculty, but are associated with their home departments and not with the General Business program.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: E. Professional & Public Service

1-2. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in professional and public service, beyond the department.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

IV. Resource Availability & Development: F. Resources for Students in the Program

1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its undergraduate students.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

Since this program is supported by so many different department, the efforts the program makes to clearly communicate the goals of the major, resources and opportunities available to students is necessary.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: G. Facilities, Equipment, & Library Holdings

1. The program has adequate facilities, equipment, and technological resources to effectively serve its students.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Program strengths are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	2
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. Other comments by the program (not rated).

Yes	1
No	3

Comments

It was difficult to evaluate since many of the responses to the questions/prompts were not- or were superficially answered.

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

- Interest in forming a committee to help inform the program.
- Using outside consultation such as an advisory committee.

Collaboration between departments
Goals and objectives of the program

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

Assessment efforts, especially how the program uses data for program improvement and communicates student progress are not clearly described.

Tracking graduates possibly exit surveys could be used more effectively
Establishing a consistent process for program oversight

3. Other comments/questions

The self-study was missing important information that would have been helpful to the review team. The self-study would have benefitted from more discussion of the information (rather than just referring to tables of the numbers).

4. Recommended Actions

1. Complete, and consistently implement, the processes for program oversight.
2. Assessment
 - a. Clearly articulate and implement a specific assessment plan. Include how the AOL measures will be leveraged to address assessment of student learning in this specific program, as well as other measures that will be used (if needed). Data should be collected, analyzed and included in the November 1, 2019 progress report.
 - b. Define a process for reviewing and making use of assessment data.
 - c. Develop a way to track use of data for program improvement. This may be more challenging in a program distributed across multiple departments, but it is important to be able to evaluate the impact of assessment on program improvement and student learning.

5. Recommended Result*

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	
Continuation without qualification	
Continuation with minor concerns	
Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit progress report to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress addressing the major concerns	X
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion.	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, recommend placing in receivership within the college, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years at the Committee's discretion.	
Non-continuation of the program.	

***A progress report that addresses the recommended actions is required. This report is due to the Dean of the College of Business & Economics by October 1, 2019 and to the Audit & Review Committee by November 1, 2019.**

***The program’s next full self-study is due by October 1, 2021 to the Dean of the College of Business & Economics and to the Audit & Review Committee by November 1, 2021.**

**Audit and Review
Discussion of the Progress Report for
General Business**

Date: 3/3/2020

Time: 2:15 pm – 3:15 pm

Place: HH 4301

Attendees: Dean John Chenoweth (Business & Econ); Department Chair/Program Coordinator Linda Amann; Bob Schramann (on behalf of Dean); Audit & Review Team Chair Yeongmin Kim; Audit & Review team members Andrea Ednie, assessment representative Catherine Chan

1) **Final Result**

- **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
- Provide a clear outline of how to coordinate the program to meet the growing needs of the students with utilizing resources across multiple departments.
- The program made great strides in program assessment. Continue to improve the assessment with focusing on solidifying and implementing the assessment plan developed so far. The committee also suggest developing more direct, course-embedded measures. Then, in the next self-study, clearly describe the assessment plan and how data have been collected using the assessment plan. Also continue to record how the assessment data are used for program curriculum development
- **Please select ONE or BOTH and fill in the appropriate year:**

An additional progress report will be due Choose an item., of **[Year]**

Next full self-study will be due to the Dean on October 1, 2021 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2021.

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Progress Report
Undergraduate Programs, 2019-2020
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Program Name: General Business

Date of Review Team Meeting: December 10, 2019

Date of Follow-Up Meeting: March 3rd, 2020 Time: 2:15-3:15 pm Location: Hyland 4301

Evaluations submitted by: Catherine Chan, Andrea Ednie, Yeongmin Kim, Hephzibah Kumpaty, Ahmad Karim

Review meeting attended by: Catherine Chan, Andrea Ednie, Yeongmin Kim, Ahmad Karim

Recommendation #1

Complete, and consistently implement, the processes for program oversight.

Recommendation #1 Overall Evaluation

Good Progress	4
Making Progress	1
Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #1

- The response discussed program assessment rather than oversight - but the detailed discussion on assessment suggests continuous efforts are being made to manage the program.
- The program has implemented a systematic, four-phase, design strategy which looks attractive and this process may aid as a meaningful assessment tool to gauge student outcomes.
- The approach offers a cumulative result in terms of data collection and insights into student success over a longer timeframe beginning from point of enrollment and into the post-graduation period.
- The four-phase strategy involves enrollment tracking, student participation and growth in internships, tracking student data through Assurance of learning exercise and Senior outcome Assessment Survey and employment prospects.

Recommendation #2

Assessment

- A. Clearly articulate and implement a specific assessment plan. Include how the AOL measures will be leveraged to address assessment of student learning in this specific program, as well as other measures that will be used (if needed). Data should be collected, analyzed and included in the November 1, 2019 progress report.
- B. Define a process for reviewing and making use of assessment data.

- C. Develop a way to track use of data for program improvement. This may be more challenging in a program distributed across multiple departments, but it is important to be able to evaluate the impact of assessment on program improvement and student learning.

Recommendation #2 Overall Evaluation

Good Progress	4
Making Progress	1
Little/No Progress	0

Comments related to recommendation #2

- It seems a tremendous amount of progress on assessment has been made.
- Assessment data has been collected and analyzed to inform program changes.
- I think the program is making good progress here. They are in the process of developing assessment tools and rubrics for use in data collection and analysis, both within the classes and across the GBM curriculum.
- It is unclear regarding the need to align COBE AOL objectives with GBM learning objectives. It appears that the program was asked to do this way in revising their SLOs. The documents provided in Appendix 8 (BBA AOL goals and objectives) and Appendix 9 (SLOs for GB majors) look somewhat similar and I think the GBM SLOs should have its identity in terms of specific traits that are unique to the GBM program.
- The report presents some assessment data from AOL and exit surveys. The SLOs are measured in MGT366, 366-22 and MGT 489 (Appendix 10). Do you have preliminary data from these assessments? I do not see data coming from Employer evaluation of student internship.
- The program has implemented use of e-portfolios to leverage AOL measure student e-learning. This is a work in progress and the report presents initial findings from content analysis and student reflections.
- Congratulations to the program for making great strides in the area of program assessment. I understand that many of the changes are rather new and a complete assessment is still under development. It is especially important at this stage to be intentional about systematically using assessment data to make informed decisions regarding the program.

Recommendations for next review. Additional progress reports required?

Yes, Please List Due Dates (e.g. in 1 year, 2 years)?	0
No	5

Next self-study should specifically address the following:

1. Provide a clear outline of how to coordinate the program to meet the growing needs of the students with utilizing resources across multiple departments.
2. The program made great strides in program assessment. Continue to improve the assessment with focusing on solidifying and implementing the assessment plan developed so far. The committee also suggest developing more direct, course-embedded measures. Then, in the next

self-study, clearly describe the assessment plan and how data have been collected using the assessment plan. Also continue to record how the assessment data are used for program curriculum development.

Additional comments:

- The faculty are to be commended for their impressive work on assessment activities.
- The faculty and the program coordinator made a good progress on coordination of the program.
- The program has implemented use of e-portfolios. Consider developing a plan to use it to inform curriculum improvement.

***Next FULL Self-study is due to the College Deans by October 1, 2021 and by November 1, 2021 to the Assessment Office.**